

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 22 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Henry Wang Group Art Unit: 3724
Serial No. 10/051,556 Examiner: Flores Sanchez, Omar
Filed: 01/17/2002
Title: STRADDLE SAFETY PUSHER SYSTEM

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being transmitted by facsimile transmission to the US Patent & Trademark Office Technology Center 3700, fax number 703-872-9306 on the date shown below:

Reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (14 pages)

David G. Maire

3/22/2005

David G. Maire, Reg. No. 34,865

Date

Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A.
390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801
telephone: 407-926-7704

10/051,556

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 22 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Henry Wang

Group Art Unit: 3724

Serial No. 10/051,556

Examiner: Flores Sanchez, Omar

Filed: 01/17/2002

Title: STRADDLE SAFETY PUSHER SYSTEM

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.111

This paper is in response to the Office Communication dated 02/08/2005. In this paper, the claims are amended and remarks are provided in support of the allowance of the amended application. A record of a teleconference between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney is also included, beginning on the next page.

(please proceed to the next page)

10/051,556

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

A telephonic interview was conducted on 17 March 2005 between Examiner Omar Flores Sanchez and the applicant's undersigned attorney.

No exhibit was shown and no demonstration was conducted.

The cited patents to Plumb and Campbell were discussed as they are applied against the rejected claims of the present invention. The undersigned attorney noted that the cited prior art devices are significantly different than the present invention in form and function, and that it should be possible to craft claim language that differentiates the present invention from these prior art patents. The Examiner agreed.

Toward that end, three significant features of the prior art were discussed in relationship to proposed claim amendments that were faxed to the Examiner for discussion and that are presented herein for consideration. First, the handles of the cited prior art devices are in a different location and have a different function than the handle of the present invention. Second, the planar regions of the cited prior art devices do not constitute a completely flat side of the device that could serve as a guide when being slid along a fence of a saw table. Third, the cited prior art devices are affixed to a work surface when in use, whereas the present invention is hand-held and portable when in use. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments appear to capture these concepts, and he suggested that they be submitted as formal amendments to the claims for a complete review.

The undersigned attorney expressed the inventor's concern over the extended duration of the pendency of this application and the attendant cost. Both the Examiner and the undersigned attorney agreed to be available for additional telephone conferences should such be helpful in moving this application to issue in the event that the amendments submitted herein are found to overcome the prior art rejections.

(please proceed to the next page)